

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
01/13/2006	Amram Mor	31019	9196
590 04/20/2007		EXAMINER NIEBAUER, RONALD T	
1			
PO Box 16446 Arlington, VA 22215		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		1609	
DEDIOD OF DESDONSE	MAII DATE	DELIVER	V MODE
]	90 04/20/2007 I	90 04/20/2007 12215 PERIOD OF RESPONSE MAIL DATE	90 04/20/2007 EXAM NIEBAUER, 2215 ART UNIT 1609 PERIOD OF RESPONSE MAIL DATE DELIVER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/564,619	MOR, AMRAM
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ronald T. Niebauer	1609
The MAILING DATE of this communica Period for Reply	tion appears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAIL - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statuto - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	LING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC, 17 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a repeation. by period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTI by statute, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. If you be timely filed If some the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
 Responsive to communication(s) filed of the communication (s) filed of the commu	This action is non-final. allowance except for formal matter	•
Disposition of Claims		
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the apple 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are versions of the above claim(s) is/are allowed. 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-23 are subject to restriction allowed.	withdrawn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the E 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by	accepted or b) objected to by n to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance correction is required if the drawing(s)	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents.	cuments have been received. cuments have been received in App he priority documents have been re Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	olication No eceived in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		Mail Date rmal Patent Application

Art Unit: 1609

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

Peptide: SEQ ID NOs: 1-5 as recited in claim 1, 8, 17 and dependent claims.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the

record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

Peptide – all claims.

The following claim(s) are generic: 1 to the species of claims 2-7; 8 to the species of claims 9-16; 17 to the species of claims 18-23.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: a special technical feature is not shared among the inventions.

From MPEP section 1850:

The situation involving the so-called Markush practice wherein a single claim defines alternatives (chemical or non-chemical) is also governed by PCT Rule 13.2. In this special situation, the requirement of a technical interrelationship and the same or corresponding special technical features as defined in PCT Rule 13.2, shall be considered to be met when the alternatives are of a similar nature. When the Markush grouping is for alternatives of chemical compounds, they shall be regarded as being of a similar nature where the following criteria are fulfilled:

- (A) All alternatives have a common property or activity; and
- (B)
- (1) A common structure is present, i.e., a significant structural element is shared by all of the alternatives; or
- (B)
- (2) In cases where the common structure cannot be the unifying criteria, all alternatives belong to a recognized class of chemical compounds in the art to which the invention pertains.

In paragraph (B)(1), above, the words "significant structural element is shared by all of the alternatives" refer to cases where the compounds share a common chemical structure which occupies a large portion of their structures, or in case the compounds have in common only a small portion of their structures, the commonly shared structure constitutes a structurally distinctive portion in view of existing prior art, and the common structure is essential to the common property or activity. The structural element may be a single component or a combination of individual components linked together. In paragraph (B)(2), above, the words "recognized class of chemical compounds" mean that there is an expectation from the knowledge in the art that members of the class will behave in the same way in the context of the claimed invention. In other words, each member could be substituted one for the other, with the expectation that the same intended result would be achieved.

In terms of this application the claims are drawn to peptides which can be structurally different. For example SEQ ID NO:1 and SEQ ID NO:2 as described only share 2 consecutive amino acids (Leu Leu) among the 13 amino acid sequence. A significant structural element is defined as a common chemical structure which occupies a large portion of the structures, so these peptides do not share a significant structural element. Consequently, there is no special technical feature uniting all of the claimed inventions.

Note that if SEQ ID NO:3 is elected, SEQ ID NOs:1,4,and 5 will be examined since SEQ ID NOs:1,4,and 5 share a common structure as SEQ ID NO:3.

Page 5

Art Unit: 1609

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ronald T. Niebauer whose telephone number is 571-270-3059. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:30am-5:00pm, alt. Friday, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mary Mosher can be reached on 571-272-0906. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PATENT EXAMINER